31.   The method of claim 23 wherein the capability parameters comprise display resolution, display pixel depth, and display refresh rate.

C) cancel

REMARKS

In the present application, Claims 1 - 26 are pending. In the above Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Butler et al.* (6,018,340) in view of *Ishkura et al.* (5,585,821). This Action was made Final.

In a previous Office Action, the Examiner contended that the term "capability parameters" was so broad as to encompass the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant still maintains that this term was clearly defined in the specification (see page 3, line 17 – 18) as including resolution, pixel depth, and/or refresh rate. For purposes of further clarification, Applicant has added new claims that illustrate these limitations on "capability parameters". As stated in the previous response, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests Applicant's invention as claimed in the amended claims.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the term " capability parameters" is so broad that the definition can be changed between elements of a claim. For example, the Examiner contends that "capability parameters" can be defined in *Butler* as the "information that is passed between GDI and the device drivers through input and output parameters of the DDI functions" (column 5, lines 29 – 42). The second element of Applicant's claim 1 substitutes selected display capabilities for the capability parameters. The Examiner contends that this is illustrated in *Butler* (column 10, lines 38 – 53). However, using the Examiner's previous definition for "capability parameters", this passage does not teach any information being substituted for the information that is passed between GDI and the device drivers. The disclosure at column 10, lines 38 – 53 simply discusses the process for calculating the X and Y coordinates of a cursor.

Therefore, Applicant maintains that not only are the elements of the present invention, as claimed in the current and amended claims, not disclosed in *Butler*, but that the combination of *Butler* with *Ishikura et al.* neither teaches nor suggests Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow Applicant's invention as set forth in claims 1 - 31. No new matter has been added by this amendment. An additional fee is required for the new claims.

2

This Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview may expedite the prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the below attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Date: November 2, 2001

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005